

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-14 have been pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Janis (U.S. Patent 5,263,158).

Claims 2, 6, 10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janis (U.S. Patent 5,263,158).

According to the foregoing, the claims are amended, new claims are added, and thus reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

The claimed embodiment determines a security level of an apparatus based upon a record of updating a virus definition file of the apparatus, and controls access permission range of the apparatus, based upon the determined security level. A prima facie case of anticipation cannot be established based upon Janis, because Janis column 6, lines 25-54 merely discusses a resource monitor providing an access profile to a resource manager. And the resource manager controls access to a resource object based upon the access profile. The access profile includes authority level of a user. However, Janis fails to disclose expressly or inherently (necessarily) “detecting a security level of a user apparatus, based upon a record of updating a virus definition file of the user apparatus; ... judging by comparing whether the security level of the user apparatus reaches with a predetermined security level; and ... in case the judging unit judges ~~that~~ the security level of the user apparatus does not reach the predetermined security level, restricting an access permission range on a network by the user of the apparatus.” In other words, Janis is silent on determining a security level based upon a record of updating a virus definition file of the user apparatus. For example, the present Application page 9, lines 13-23 and page 17, line 19 to page 18, line 18 support the claim amendments.

Specifically, a benefit the claimed embodiments is when the security level of the user apparatus is, for example, low, access to certain devices, for example, devices existing in the in-house network can be permitted, and when the security level of the user apparatus is high, access to certain device, for example, devices outside of the network is also permitted.

Dependent claims recite their own patentably distinguishing features or are at least patentably distinguishing due to its dependency from independent claim 15. In view of the

foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS 15-18

New claims 15-18 are supported, for example, by page 3, line 22 to page 4, line 2, and page 6, line 20 to page 7, line 27, and page 8, line 9-16, and page 11, line 27 to page 12, line 8, and page 17, line 19 to page 18, line 18, and FIGS. 5 and 6 of the present Application.

In contrast to Janis, claim 15 is directed to ensuring a desired security level on the network by "determining a security level of a user terminal upon a network access for the user terminal, based upon one or more of security information updating history of the user apparatus, port access information of the user terminal, or programs and/or scripts downloaded and/or executable at the user terminal, and ensuring a predetermined security level on the network, according to the determined security level of the user terminal."

Dependent claims 16-18 recite their own patentably distinguishing features or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claim 15.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 2, 2007

By: / Mehdi D. Sheikerz /
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501